

The Imprint of Gravitational Waves on the Cosmic Microwave Background

Robert Crittenden,¹ J. Richard Bond,² Richard L. Davis,¹ George Efstathiou,³ Paul J. Steinhardt¹

⁽¹⁾ *Department of Physics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104*

⁽²⁾ *Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A7*

⁽³⁾ *Department of Astrophysics, Oxford University, Oxford, England OX1 3RH*

Abstract

Long-wavelength gravitational waves can induce significant temperature anisotropy in the cosmic microwave background. Distinguishing this from anisotropy induced by energy density fluctuations is critical for testing inflationary cosmology and theories of large-scale structure formation. We describe full radiative transport calculations of the two contributions and show that they differ dramatically at angular scales below a few degrees. We show how anisotropy experiments probing large- and small-angular scales can combine to distinguish the imprint due to gravitational waves.

PACS NOs: 98.80.Cq, 98.80.Es, 98.70.Vc

The cosmic microwave background (CMB) temperature anisotropy may be induced by energy density fluctuations *and* by gravitational waves [1], corresponding to scalar and tensor metric perturbations, respectively. Although anisotropy measurements probing angular scales above a few degrees (*e.g.*, COBE [2]) cannot discriminate scalar from tensor [3], we show in this Letter that the two contributions can be separated when data from smaller angle experiments are used as well.

Resolving the two contributions relies upon detailed theoretical predictions for the form of the multipole components, $a_{\ell m}^{(S)}$ and $a_{\ell m}^{(T)}$, of the relative temperature pattern on the sky, $\Delta T/T(\theta, \phi)$. For inflationary models, each multipole for the two modes is predicted to be statistically independent and Gaussian-distributed, fully specified by angular power spectra, $C_\ell^{(S)} = \langle |a_{\ell m}^{(S)}|^2 \rangle$ and $C_\ell^{(T)} = \langle |a_{\ell m}^{(T)}|^2 \rangle$. Although $C_\ell^{(S)}$ has been calculated before [4], $C_\ell^{(T)}$ was previously known only for low multipoles, $\ell \lesssim 30$, relevant for angles above a few degrees [1,3,5]. For these ℓ 's, the dominant spatial wavelengths contributing to $C_\ell^{(T)}$ and $C_\ell^{(S)}$ were outside the horizon at photon decoupling, and both scalar and tensor modes induce similar red shifts and blue shifts in the CMB [1,3,5]. For example, COBE's DMR is unable to distinguish the two contributions due to cosmic variance (from the theory signal) and experimental noise, although their sum can be determined from one year of DMR data to within 30% (see Fig. 2a below), improving to about 15% with four full years of data.

In this Letter, we compute $C_\ell^{(T)}$ to much higher multipoles, and show that the predicted $C_\ell^{(T)}$ becomes highly suppressed relative to $C_\ell^{(S)}$ at large ℓ . The dominant wavelengths for $\ell \gtrsim 30$ were inside the horizon at decoupling. Inside the horizon, scalar-mode anisotropies are enhanced by the gravitational instability of density perturbations and by Thomson scattering from moving electrons, whereas gravitational waves disperse as freely propagating, massless excitations and red shift away. Taking advantage of this difference, we find that combining experiments at small and large angular scales can determine the scalar and tensor components. Current CMB anisotropy data at small scales is not yet good enough to do so, especially since some of the signals observed may be Galactic rather than cosmic in origin, but the statistical errors of these and other near-future experiments are small enough to

allow separation at about the two sigma level, as we show here.

Separating tensor from scalar is essential for theories of cosmic structure formation since it is from $C_\ell^{(S)}$ that we can infer the amplitude of the primordial density fluctuations. It also provides a critical test for inflationary cosmology [3,5,6]. All inflation models produce a post-inflation spectrum of scalar and tensor metric fluctuations with some tilt away from the scale-invariant (spectral index $n_s = 1$) form. The degree of tilt depends upon the details of the inflation model but may be quite significant [3,5,6] ($n_s \gtrsim 0.5$). For a wide range of inflation models, but not all, the gravitational wave content of the CMB anisotropy is related to the tilt [3,5,6]:

$$C_2^{(T)}/C_2^{(S)} \approx 7(1 - n_s) , \quad (1)$$

where $C_2^{(T)}$ and $C_2^{(S)}$ are the $\ell = 2$ (quadrupole) components of the power spectrum. Confirmation of Eq.(1) would provide detailed information about the kind of inflation that took place and, consequently, about the evolution of the very early Universe.

For a given sum of $C_\ell^{(T)}$ and $C_\ell^{(S)}$ fixed by large angular scale measurements, a larger tensor component reduces the small-angle anisotropy. Several other factors can have a qualitatively similar effect (*e.g.*, increased tilt, $1 - n_s$; decreased baryon density, Ω_B ; and a nonstandard recombination history), but there are *quantitative* differences which we now describe.

To compute $C_\ell^{(T)}$, we evolve the distribution function, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{q}, t)$, for photons at position $\mathbf{x}$ at time t with momentum $\mathbf{q}$, using first-order perturbation theory of the general relativistic Boltzmann equation for radiative transfer [4], with a Thomson scattering source term. Photon polarization is included by making $\mathbf{f}$ a 4-dimensional vector with components related to the Stokes parameters (f_s with $s = t, p, u, v$ correspond to the usual I, Q, U, V Stokes notation) and applying Chandrasekhar's development of the scattering source term for Rayleigh (and thus Thomson) scattering in a plane parallel atmosphere [7]. In the scalar case, only f_t and the 'polarization' f_p are needed, so 2 transfer equations are required [4]. In the tensor case f_u also does not vanish, but it is related to f_p , so again only two perturbed

transfer equations turn out to be required. To describe these equations, we introduce the relative perturbed distribution functions [4] $\Delta_s^{(T)} = 4\delta f_s / (T_0 \partial \bar{f} / \partial T_0)$, where T_0 is the CMB temperature and $\bar{f}$ is the unperturbed Planck distribution.

To evolve the coupled equations, both $\Delta_s^{(T)}$ and the metric are expanded in plane waves. In the frame in which the wavevector $\mathbf{k}$ is along the z-axis, the gravitational wave degrees of freedom in the metric are the transverse traceless modes, $h_+ = h_{11} = -h_{22}$ and $h_\times = h_{12} = h_{21}$, which obey an Einstein equation, the wave equation for free massless particles: $\ddot{h}_\epsilon + 2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{h}_\epsilon + k^2 h_\epsilon = 0$, $\epsilon = +, \times$. Here the dot denotes derivative *wrt* conformal time, $\tau = \int dt/a(t)$ where a is the expansion factor, solved for by evolving the Friedmann equation.

The radiative transfer equations for the two gravity wave polarizations separate, having an overall factor of $\cos(2\phi)$ for $\epsilon = +$ and of $\sin(2\phi)$ for $\epsilon = \times$, where (θ, ϕ) are the polar angles, which we remove by introducing new variables, following Polnarev [8]

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_t^{(T)} &= \tilde{\Delta}_{t+}^{(T)}(1 - \mu^2) \cos 2\phi + \tilde{\Delta}_{t\times}^{(T)}(1 - \mu^2) \sin 2\phi \\ \Delta_p^{(T)} &= \tilde{\Delta}_{p+}^{(T)}(1 + \mu^2) \cos 2\phi + \tilde{\Delta}_{p\times}^{(T)}(1 + \mu^2) \sin 2\phi \\ \Delta_u^{(T)} &= -\tilde{\Delta}_{u+}^{(T)}2\mu \sin 2\phi + \tilde{\Delta}_{u\times}^{(T)}2\mu \cos 2\phi\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

The combination $\tilde{\Delta}_{p\epsilon}^{(T)} + \tilde{\Delta}_{u\epsilon}^{(T)}$ is unexcited by gravity waves, as is $\Delta_v^{(T)}$, so the 4 Stokes radiative transfer equations reduce to two:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{\Delta}}_{t\epsilon}^{(T)} &= -ik\mu\tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon}^{(T)} - \dot{h}_\epsilon - a\sigma_T n_e \tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon}^{(T)} + a\sigma_T n_e \Psi_\epsilon, \\ \dot{\tilde{\Delta}}_{p\epsilon}^{(T)} &= -ik\mu\tilde{\Delta}_{p\epsilon}^{(T)} - a\sigma_T n_e \tilde{\Delta}_{p\epsilon}^{(T)} - a\sigma_T n_e \Psi_\epsilon, \\ \Psi_\epsilon &\equiv \left[\frac{1}{10}\tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon,0}^{(T)} - \frac{1}{7}\tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon,2}^{(T)} + \frac{3}{70}\tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon,4}^{(T)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{3}{5}\tilde{\Delta}_{p\epsilon,0}^{(T)} - \frac{6}{7}\tilde{\Delta}_{p\epsilon,2}^{(T)} - \frac{3}{70}\tilde{\Delta}_{p\epsilon,4}^{(T)} \right].\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

Here σ_T is the Thomson scattering cross-section, and n_e , the free electron density, is evolved using a careful treatment of the recombination atomic physics.

As in the scalar case [4], we solve these equations by expanding in Legendre polynomials, *e.g.*, $\tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon} = \sum_\ell (2\ell + 1) \tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon,\ell} P_\ell(\mu)$, converting (3) to a hierarchy of coupled equations. Our solutions, $\tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon,\ell}(k, \tau)$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_{p\epsilon,\ell}(k, \tau)$, can be combined into the power spectrum by summing over $\mathbf{k}$ and polarizations:

$$C_\ell^{(T)} = \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\ell-1)\ell(\ell+1)(\ell+2) \left\langle \left| \frac{\tilde{\Delta}_{tG,\ell-2}}{(2\ell-1)(2\ell+1)} - 2 \frac{\tilde{\Delta}_{tG,\ell}}{(2\ell-1)(2\ell+3)} + \frac{\tilde{\Delta}_{tG,\ell+2}}{(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)} \right|^2 \right\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}_{tG,\ell} \equiv (\tilde{\Delta}_{t+,\ell} - i\tilde{\Delta}_{t\times,\ell})/\sqrt{2}$. A similar expression applies for the polarization power spectrum. [9] A useful check is to assume recombination is sudden at $\tau = \tau_r$. The free-streaming solution from τ_r to the present τ_0 is then $\tilde{\Delta}_{t\epsilon,\ell} = (-i)^\ell \int_{\tau_r}^{\tau_0} d\tau j_\ell(k(\tau_0 - \tau)) \dot{h}_\epsilon(\tau)$. Substitution into eq.(4) gives the Abbott and Wise [1] formula for $C_\ell^{(T)}$, with which our numerical results agree for low ℓ .

In this paper, we discuss results for standard cold dark matter (CDM) models with normal recombination, although it is straightforward to adapt the numerical codes to other cosmological models (*e.g.*, mixed hot and cold dark matter). We let n_s , the ratio of tensor-to-scalar quadrupole anisotropy, the baryon density Ω_B and the Hubble parameter [10] h freely vary.

Fig. 1 shows a CDM model with $\Omega_B = 0.05$, $h = 0.5$ and $n_s = 0.85$, which accounts for the slight downward tilt in $C_\ell^{(S)}$ at small ℓ . (We plot $\ell(\ell+1)C_\ell$, since it is flat for scale-invariant ($n_s = 1$) $C_\ell^{(S)}$ at small ℓ .) The sharp increase in $C_\ell^{(S)}$ for $\ell \gtrsim 50$ followed by increasingly damped oscillations are due to adiabatic compression of photons and Doppler shifts during decoupling [4]. The tensor mode behaves quite differently. The first moments drop sharply; then the curve settles to a tilted spectrum similar to the scalar case for $5 \gtrsim \ell \gtrsim 50$. At $\ell \gtrsim 50$, the tensor drops sharply just as the scalar rises. We have set $C_2^{(T)}/C_2^{(S)} \approx 1$, the inflation prediction of Eq. 1 for a tilt of $n_s = 0.85$. We also illustrate how a scalar-only spectrum with low Ω_B (*e.g.*, the dashed curve) partially mimics the scalar-plus-tensor shape for $\Omega_B = 0.05$, (assuming a larger $C_2^{(S)}$). Clearly, precise measurements are required to separately determine $C_2^{(T)}/C_2^{(S)}$ and Ω_B .

FIGURES

FIG. 1. (a) Angular Power Spectra for the tilted standard CDM model shown for tensor, scalar and the sum. The light dashed line is an $\Omega_B = 0.01$ model. (b) shows the filters for the experiments used in this paper as examples (heavy lines). The light lines are other representative experiments.

The filter functions, which indicate the experimental sensitivity as a function of ℓ , are shown for various experiments in Fig. 1b. The theoretical prediction for the *rms* fluctuations at each of the points in an experiment is found by multiplying $C_\ell/4\pi$ by the filter and summing over ℓ, m . From Fig.1, we see that large-angle experiments (*e.g.*, DMR [2], MIT [11] and Tenerife [12]) are equally sensitive to tensor and scalar modes, smaller angle experiments (*e.g.* SP89 [13] and OVRO [16]) are sensitive mostly to scalar, while the intermediate SP91 [14,15] can measure some tensor, although predominantly scalar.

A quantitative experimental fit to cosmological parameters is obtained by constructing likelihood functions $\mathcal{L}_e(C_2^{(S)}, C_2^{(T)}, n_s, \Omega_B, h)$ for each experiment, e , assuming Gaussian statistics. [18] Assuming the experiments are statistically independent (because they cover unrelated regions of the sky or very different angular wavebands), we combine the $\mathcal{L}_e$'s to get the full likelihood, $\mathcal{L} = \prod_e \mathcal{L}_e$, as shown in Fig. 2. For all but DMR, $\mathcal{L}_e$ is calculated using Bayesian techniques [18] which take into account the removal of any linear combinations of the data such as gradients or averages by marginalizing over the coefficients, assuming uniform prior probability distribution in these coefficients. For SP91, the method was extended to treat simultaneously the 4 frequency channels. For DMR, we used the Smoot *et al.* '90 A+B X 53 A+B' (quadrupole-subtracted) correlation function [2] with a Gaussian approximation for the likelihood [19] A more complete analysis will only be possible once the DMR data are released. In Fig. 2, we have taken $\Omega_B = 0.05(2h)^{-2}$, consistent with nucleosynthesis limits [20], and $h = 0.5$.

Fig. 2(a) displays the DMR likelihood contours in the $C_2^{(S)}-C_2^{(T)}$ plane for fixed n_s (0.85), demonstrating that DMR can measure $C_2^{(S)} + C_2^{(T)}$, but cannot discriminate scalar

and tensor. A preferred tensor-scalar ratio does arise in Fig. 2(b) as soon as we incorporate small angle data. Figure 2(b) combines the DMR data, the 4-frequency-channel data from a 9 point strip [14] and a 13 point strip [15] in the SP91 experiment, as well as SP89 [13] and OVRO [16] data (which give weak upper limits but no detections). The SP91 scans appear to have detections, but the signal may be contaminated by unknown sources.

Fig. 2(b) is tantalizing but inconclusive evidence for a gravitational wave contribution. Future refinement can be anticipated by using simulated data sets, constructed by taking single realizations of theoretical signals and adding experimental noise associated with statistical errors (but no systematic errors). In Figure 2(c) and 2(d), the input signal is for a standard CDM model with $n_s = 0.85$ and equal $C_2^{(T)}$ and $C_2^{(S)}$ ($[7.5 \times 10^{-6}]^2$). We then simulate a suite of plausible near-future experiments: DMR with 4-year error bars; six 13 point strips from an SP91 configuration (18-27 μK error bars for each of the 4 frequency channels); six 9 point strips from an SP89 [13] configuration; and an OVRO22 configuration (7' beam, 22' double-difference throw, with 25 μK error bars). Reduced ($\approx 15\mu K$) error bars were taken for SP89 to represent ongoing or planned experiments with beams $\sim 0.5^\circ$ which, with multifrequency observations, can achieve these sensitivities [17].

Fig. 2(d) shows two projections onto the $C_2^{(S)}-n_s$ plane. The heavy contours are the likelihood if $C_2^{(T)}/C_2^{(S)}$ is restricted to the trajectories predicted by inflation, Eq. (1). The maximum lies within 10% of the input signal. In contrast, the light curves show the contours when the (unrestricted) maximum likelihood value for the given $C_2^{(S)}$ and n_s is taken. The extended 1 sigma band along $C_2^{(T)}/C_2^{(S)} \approx (2 - 5.2(1 - n_s))^2$ indicates an inability to distinguish large tilt from large tensor component for these sensitivities. The band runs across the inflation prediction (heavy lines), intersecting in a narrow range about $n_s \approx 0.83$, very close to the input value.

We conclude that current and near-future anisotropy experiments are unable by themselves to definitively test inflation (Eq. 1) or determine the gravitational wave contribution to the CMB. For the short-term, conclusions can only be drawn by adding extra assumptions and/or other data. For example, we have already shown in Figs. 2(c,d) that, if Eq. 1 is

assumed, n_s and the gravitational wave imprint can be determined to within 2 sigma. Alternatively, other cosmological constraints can be invoked. For example, a variety of arguments imply that the *rms* amplitude of the density fluctuations on scales of $8\text{ h}^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ (σ_8), which is used to measure the amount of nonlinear dynamics in large-scale structure calculations, cannot lie outside of the range 0.45 and 1 for CDM models [21,6]; this translates to the shaded region in Fig. 2(d). If one assumes a model of galaxy clustering with linear biasing, a tilt $n_s \lesssim 0.65$ is required for standard CDM models to reproduce the galaxy correlation function [6] (which would exclude our input model). This severe restriction may be relaxed with less simplistic CDM models of galaxy formation, and in cosmologies with more power in the density fluctuations than CDM has on large scales [21].

The long-term future is brighter. Extensive mapping of the microwave sky on small and intermediate angular scales can lead to highly accurate determinations of the spectrum; e.g., using the filter functions of Fig. 1, we find that the limiting cosmic variance uncertainty in $\Delta T/T$ is only a few per cent for SP89 and SP91 configurations. Even at large angles where the cosmic variance is higher, we find that 5% accuracy should be achievable. Hence, given optimal experimental designs for measuring large and small angle anisotropy, there should be sufficient resolution for a fully independent test for inflation, theories of large-scale structure, and the imprint of gravitational waves.

FIG. 2. Likelihood contour maps for scalar $([C_2^{(S)}]^{1/2}/10^{-5})$ *v.s.* tensor $([C_2^{(T)}]^{1/2}/10^{-5})$ amplitudes are shown in (a),(b) and (c) for the standard CDM model with fixed $n_s = 0.85$ tilt. The light curves are 1, 2 and 3 sigma lines, the heavy curve or ‘x’ gives the maximum likelihood. (a) DMR only. (b) DMR plus the 9 and 13 point SP91 data, along with SP89 plus OVRO. (c) shows the maps with simulated large and small angle data consisting of DMR (with 4 year error bars), six 13 point SP91 strips, six 9 point SP89 strips and one OVRO22 strip. The mean CDM signal input into the simulated data is denoted by the square. (d) Shows 1,2 and 3 sigma likelihood contours for the simulated data in $[C_2^{(S)}]^{1/2}-n_s$ space, constrained to the $C_2^{(T)}/C_2^{(S)}$ trajectory defined by Eq.(1) (solid) and the unconstrained maximum likelihood trajectory (dashed). Shading indicates the range for which CDM models are not dynamically viable.

We thank P. Lubin and M. Turner for useful conversations. This research was supported by the DOE at Penn (DOE-EY-76-C-02-3071), NSERC at Toronto, the SERC at Oxford and the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research.

REFERENCES

- [1] L.F. Abbott M. Wise, *Nucl. Phys. B* **244**, 541 (1984); A.I. Starobinsky, *Sov. Astron. Lett.* **11**, 133 (1985).
- [2] G.F. Smoot *et al.* , *Astrophys. J. Lett.***396**, L1 (1992).
- [3] R.L. Davis, H.M. Hodges, G.F. Smoot, P.J. Steinhardt, and M.S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1856 (1992).
- [4] J.R. Bond and G. Efstathiou, *Astrophys. J.* **285**, L45 (1984); *Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc.* **226**, 655-687 (1987); J.R. Bond, in *The Early Universe*, ed. W. Unruh and G. Semenoff, Dordrecht: Reidel (1988); G. Efstathiou, in *Physics of the Early Universe*, ed. A. Heavens, A. Davies and J. Peacock, Scottish Universities Summer School Publications (1990).
- [5] F. Lucchin, S. Matarrese, and S. Mollerach, *Astrophys. J.Lett.* **401**, 49 (1992); D. Salopek *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 3602 (1992); A. Liddle and D. Lyth, *Phys.Lett.B* **291**, 391 (1992); V. Sahni and T. Souradeep, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A7**, 3541 (1992); J.E. Lidsey and P. Coles, *Mon. Not. Roy. astr. Soc.* **258**, 57P (1992).
- [6] F.C. Adams, J.R. Bond, K. Freese, J.A. Frieman and A.V. Olinto, *Phys. Rev. D***47**, 426 (1993).
- [7] S. Chandrasekhar, **Radiation Transfer** (Dover: New York, 1960), pp. 1-53.
- [8] A.G. Polnarev, *Sov. Astron.* **29**, 607 (1985).
- [9] We find the polarization induced by the tensor mode is negligibly small ($\ll 1\%$), whereas models with early reionization have significant polarization, an added discriminant that we will not explore here.
- [10] $H_0 = 100h \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.
- [11] K. Ganga *et al. preprint* (1993).
- [12] A. Lasenby *et al. preprint* (1993).

- [13] P. Meinhold, & P. Lubin, *Astrophys. J. Lett* **370**, 11 (1991).
- [14] T. Gaier, J. Schuster, J. Gunderson, T. Koch, M. Seiffert, P. Meinhold, and P. Lubin, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **398**, L1 (1992).
- [15] J. Schuster *et al.* , UCSB preprint (1993).
- [16] A.C.S. Readhead *et al.* ,*Astrophys. J.* **346** 556, (1989).
- [17] *e.g.*, P. Meinhold *et al.* *preprint* (1993); J. Gunderson *et al.* *preprint* (1993).
- [18] J.R. Bond, G. Efstathiou, P.M. Lubin, and P. Meinhold, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 2179 (1991).
- [19] The Gaussian variance for the likelihood adds to the observational errors [2] an all-sky cosmic variance and a (small) signal-noise interference variance computed assuming a uniform pixel noise which best-fits the DMR error bars.
- [20] T.P. Walker, G. Steigman, D.N. Schramm, K.A. Olive, & H.S. Kang, *Astrophys. J* **376**, 51 (1991).
- [21] G. Efstathiou, J.R. Bond and S.D.M. White *Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc.***258**, 1P (1992).

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9303014v1>

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9303014v1>